

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed April 2, 2003, included an objection to the as-filed title. Because the "Amendment A" mailed July 30, 2003, does not appear to have been entered, even in part, the correction to the title as well as an updating of the cross-reference to prior applications has been re-presented. Also re-presented is the revised paragraph from page 7.

The revised Abstract presented on page 6 of this Amendment differs from that previously presented but is submitted to be a fair representation of the presently claimed method.

In the aforementioned Official Action, original claims 10-18 were rejected for various reasons. The aforementioned Amendment A attempted to amend claims 10-16, to cancel claims 17-18, and to present new claims 27-43. In the hope of minimizing confusion, pages 3-5 of this Amendment cancel each of claims 10-43 and begin the numbering of newly presented claims at 44. If this is improper, the Examiner is requested to renumber the newly presented claims appropriately.

In passing, note that prior counsel indicated in Amendment A that a change in inventorship would be required due to the then-presented claims. The undersigned presently suspects that the change in question was believed to be necessary due to the switch in claim type (from method of making a coated substrate to a method of making a crosslinked composition) in the aforementioned Amendment A, and is in the process of investigating this, but has not yet confirmed that suspicion.

Claim 44 reverts to the general format used in claim 10 as originally presented – method of applying a composition to a substrate so as to form a laminate – while (hopefully) clarifying the materials present in that composition. Specifically, the polymer component now is presented in terms of a reaction product of two sub-components, each of which is described in terms of its structure as opposed to how each is made.

Claims 45-49 further define one sub-component of the reaction product component and finds support at, e.g., p. 5 and the paragraphs that bridge pp. 6-7 of the specification as filed.

Claim 50 finds support at, e.g., the paragraph bridging pp. 5-6; claims 51-52 find support at, e.g., pp. 4-5; claim 53 finds support at, e.g., the full paragraph on p. 4; claim 54 finds support at, e.g., the second full paragraph on p. 7; claim 55 finds support at, e.g., pp. 3 and 9; claim 56 finds support in, e.g., original claims 12 and 14; claim 57 finds support in, e.g., original claim 13 as filed; claims 58 and 60 find support in, e.g., original claim 16 as filed; claim 59 finds support in, e.g., original claim 15 as filed.

Turning now to the last substantive action on the merits, certain claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,674,951 (the '951 patent). Applicants respectfully submit that the '951 patent neither teaches nor suggests the presently claimed invention.

First, the component of the '951 patent that is alleged to correspond to the reaction product component of claim 44 involves reacting an *isocyanate*-terminated polyoxetane with a polyether or polyester to form block copolymers having *urethane* or *isocyanate* linkages. See, e.g., the Abstract, Summary of the Invention, lines 32-48 of col. 2, etc.

Second, the block copolymers from the '951 patent subsequently are crosslinked with mono-, di-, tri-, or tetrafunctional amines. See, e.g., lines 41-57 of col. 5. These are chemically distinct from *amino resins*, a term of art that relates to a specific class of crosslinking compounds. Further, the amines from the '951 patent can react with the isocyanate groups (see the paragraph bridging cols. 2-3) whereas the functional groups of the reaction product component of claim 44 do not similarly react with amine groups.

The other references of record – US Pat. Nos. 4,603,074, 4,931,582, and 3,922,457 – were cited to make up for deficiencies in the teaching of the '951 patent. However, now that the deficiencies of the '951 patent have been shown to be greater than described in the last substantive action, the teachings of the references in question must be stretched even further so as to suggest any of the pending claims. Further comments on the specific teachings of these references is believed to be unnecessary until a *prima facie* case of obviousness can be made with respect to the presently pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections in the prior outstanding no longer are applicable and request continued examination of this application.

Questions or comments regarding this submission should be directed to the attention of the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Burleson, Reg. No. 38,090
Attorney for Applicants

March 25, 2004

OMNOVA Solutions Inc.
Law Department
175 Ghent Road
Fairlawn, Ohio 44333-3300